

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 49, No. 15

APRIL 23, 1956

WHOLE NO. 1210

CONTENTS

- C. T. MURPHY: A Survey of Recent Work on Aristophanes and Old Comedy . . . 201

(A list of the earlier articles in this series appears on page 203.)

- Notes and News 211

American Academy in Rome, Fulbright grants for Summer 1957. — John Hay Whitney Foundation, Fellowships 1957-58. — *Personalia*: Dr. Christine Mohrmann.

- Books Received 212

A SURVEY OF RECENT WORK ON ARISTOPHANES AND OLD COMEDY

1. Preliminary Remarks

The following survey takes as its point of departure the fourth volume, by Wilhelm Schmid, of W. Schmid-O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*,¹ which is almost entirely devoted to a full and comprehensive summary of Old Attic Comedy, Aristophanes, his predecessors and contemporaries. While this article was in preparation, M. Platnauer's *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1954) came to hand; the chapter on "Greek Comedy" by K. J. Dover is a welcome, lucid account of the major work in the field during the first half of this century, and includes references to works as late as 1953. This indispensable introduction to the subject would make the present survey unnecessary, if Dover were not so highly selective, or limited in his citations. The additions which I have been able to make with the help of Marouzeau, *L'Année Philologique*,² and other bibliographical aids are not likely to provide a complete bibliography; I am sure that there is much

that I have missed. But it is hoped that this survey will provide a start for further study.³

In general, it may be said that the past nine or ten years have seen no major or revolutionary works in the field—nothing to set beside the fundamental work of Zielinski, Wilamowitz, Körte, or even Gilbert Murray, whose *Aristophanes* (Oxford 1933), despite its limitations, remains the one work in English primarily about Aristophanes and his comedies. Attention has focused on external matters: dramatic antiquities (Pickard-Cambridge), the social background of Old Comedy (Ehrenberg), or the relation of Old and Middle Comedy to the phylaces and other related comic types (T. B. L. Webster and others). There have been attempts to reach greater precision and exactness in interpreting the ancient evidence (both literary and archaeological) and some of the broad generalizations about the form and origins of Old Comedy which were taken as virtually established some years ago (and which are still stated as "facts" in most of our literary histories and handbooks) have been questioned or challenged. Finally, one new

1. I. iv.2.1 (Munich 1946; = *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* VII.i.4).

2. J. Marouzeau and J. Ernst, *L'Année Philologique* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1924ff.) The latest volume available to me in making up this survey (XXIII, dated 1954) includes items through 1952; I regret that the two more recent numbers (Vols. XXIV and XXV, dated 1955, and including items through 1954) reached me too late to be of full use.

3. The following items have been advisedly omitted: (1) translations into languages other than English; (2) brief notes on textual readings, unless they offer some important modification of accepted interpretations. Items marked by an asterisk (*) have not been seen by the present writer.

Despite the arbitrary limitations which I have imposed on this survey, I should like to keep my own bibliographical notes as complete as possible, and I hope that friendly colleagues will inform me of any important omissions they may find here.

edition of the complete works is in progress (Cantarella), and one of the older editions is being re-edited (Coulon).

2. Origins and Early Comedy

Several of the accepted explanations of the origins have recently been criticized: the conception of a "Komos-sequence," consisting of a choral performance of Parodos-Agon-Parabasis, in which many scholars saw the origin of the first part of Old Comedy, had already been questioned by Schmid.⁴ At present there is a tendency to consider the Parabasis as the original opening song of the chorus, i.e., the primitive Parodos; this view is adopted by W. Kranz, arts. "Parabasis," RE XVIII. 3 (1949) 1124-1126, and "Parodos," ibid. XVIII. 4 (1949) 1694.

One of the most complete recent reviews of the ancient evidence (mainly archaeological) is to be found in a monograph by Hans Herter, *Vom dionysischen Tanz zum Komischen Spiel* (Iserlohn 1947), which is sharply critical of previous treatments of comic origins. Rejecting the commonly accepted view of Körte that the actors' costume and (in general) the scenes of the second part of Old Comedy were imported into Attica from Doric farces, Herter argues that there is evidence to show that both the chorus and the actors' part of Old Comedy descend from the performances of the 'Ithyphallos' at Athens; thus the Aristotelian account of the origin of Comedy in *ta phallika* is fully vindicated. Herter also stresses the probability of a common origin for comedy and satyr-drama.

In reply to Herter, Max Pohlenz, in "Die Entstehung der attische Komödie," *Nach. der Akad. der Wiss. in Göttingen* (1949) 31-44, has re-examined and analyzed the evidence in an excellent summarizing article. He rejects as not proven Herter's theory of a common source for chorus and actors and reaffirms the traditional view of the composite origin of Comedy. A further analysis of the formal structure of Comedy suggests not two, but three separate forms from which Comedy may be derived: (1) the Attic Komos, which gave rise to the Parabasis (although certain features of the preserved Parabases must belong to the later development of Old Comedy); (2) the "iambic scenes" of the

second part, which he believes (with Körte) were imported from the Peloponnesus; (3) the Agon and related scenes, which may derive from a choral performance different in nature from the Komos; these scenes were eventually combined with the Komos-chorus.⁵ Pohlenz also calls particular attention to the type of Agon in which a hostile chorus, after a physical attack on the principal character, is won over in the Agon (*Ach. and Av.*); he considers this type to be the older form, since the debate between two actors could easily develop from this along the lines seen in *Eq. and Vesp.*, where the chorus finds a champion to uphold its case in one of the actors. Whether or not one can accept all of Pohlenz's views, this is one of the best recent articles on the subject of origins.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published weekly from October for sixteen (16) issues, except for any weeks in which there is an academic vacation. Volume 49 contains issues dated October 17, 24; November 14, 28; December 12 (1955); January 9, 23, 30; February 6, 27; March 5, 19; April 9, 16, 23, 30 (1956).

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of publication, Fordham University, 441 East Fordham Road, New York 58, N. Y.

General subscription price, \$3.75 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$4.25. Price to members of the C. A. A. S., \$3.25. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers, to subscribers, 20 cents, to others, 30 cents prepaid (otherwise 30 cents and 40 cents). If Affidavit to invoice is required, 60 cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, a subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to the *Classical Journal*) is included in the membership fee of the C. A. A. S.; whose members may also take *Classical Outlook*, *Classical Journal*, and *Classical Bulletin* at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer of the C. A. A. S., Prof. F. Gordon Stockin, Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.

Reentered as second class matter December 14, 1950 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925 authorized December 14, 1950.

STAFF

EDITOR

Edward A. Robinson.....Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

William H. Stahl.....New York University, New York 53, N. Y.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Herbert W. Benario.....Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.
Lionel Casson.....New York University, New York 3, N. Y.
Louis H. Feldman.....Yeshiva University, New York 33, N. Y.
Philip Mayerson.....New York University, New York 3, N. Y.
Martin Oswald.....Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.
John F. Reilly.....Sacred Heart High School, Yonkers, N. Y.

4. W. Schmid-O. Stählin, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* (see *supra* note 1) Lit. (Munich 1934) 530-531.

5. Pohlenz does not mention the older, but still fundamental work of A. C. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* (Oxford 1927), where the probable existence of an independent choral performance combining (1) and (3) is demonstrated.

The older conventional view of the Peloponnesian origin of the actors' costume and appurtenances is also maintained by Pickard-Cambridge (*Dramatic Festivals*) and by T. B. L. Webster ("The Costume of the Actors etc."), for which see the following section (3) on Dramatic Antiquities.

A very readable discussion of the origins may also be found in an article by P. Mazon, "La Farce dans Aristophane et les origins de la comédie en Grèce", *Revue de l'Histoire du Théâtre* 3 (1951) 7-18. Mazon points out the fact that the farcical elements are most prominent in the second part of the plays; each scene could constitute a complete skit or short farce of a popular nature. The prologue is often like the "barker's spiel" before a popular entertainment at a county fair today: viz., a few jokes or "gags" to gain attention; an explanation of what the entertainment is to be; and perhaps a sample of the fare to be expected. The complicated choral passages of the Agon and Parabasis seem to Mazon to indicate that these parts are later additions to and developments from an earlier, more farcical type of comedy.⁶

As for the earliest written Comedy, the fragments of Epicharmus have been re-edited, with a good bit of conjectural comment and interpretation, by A. Olivieri, *Frammenti della commedia greca e del mimo nella Sicilia e nella Magna Grecia* (Naples 1946-47); since Kaibel's fundamental edition of these fragments has long been out of print and is extremely difficult to procure, it may be useful to know that a later edition is now available. A thorough summarizing article by E. Wüst, "Epicharmos und die alte attische Komödie," *RhM* 93 (1950) 337-364, lists and discusses the views of previous scholars. Wüst himself argues that Epicharmus had little or no influence on Old Attic Comedy; in particular, the debates which apparently were featured in several of Epicharmus' comedies can have had no influence on the Agon of Attic Comedy; while mythological burlesque, which is so prominent in Doric Comedy, is common to all Greeks and need not have been imported to Attica from abroad. Though this startling theory is perhaps overstated by Wüst, it does appear likely that

the influence of Epicharmus on Attic Comedy has usually been exaggerated.⁷

W. B. Stanford, "On the *Odysseus-automolos* of Epicharmus," *CPh* 45 (1950) 167-169, criticizes the usual view that this play showed Odysseus as a coward, shirking the dangerous mission assigned him by the Greeks.

On the relationship of later Doric Comedy, especially in South Italy, to Attic Comedy, see the articles cited below in section 10.

3. Dramatic Antiquities

The major item in this field is, of course, the final work of the late Sir Arthur Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (Oxford 1953); it contains the author's customary exhaustive discussion of all problems relating to the productions of the plays (e.g., the festivals, masks, costumes, chorus, dancing, etc.), with a good bibliography. This work will be the fundamental source for many years to come for those who labor in the history of the

7. On Epicharmus, see now the studies of M. Gigante, W. Kamel, and A. Setti noted in *L'Année Philologique* XXIV 63.

Professor Murphy's article is the thirteenth in the CW series of Surveys of recent work in the various fields of classical scholarship and teaching. The earlier papers have been:

E. H. Haight, "Notes on Recent Publications about the Ancient Novel," CW 46 (1952-53) 233-237.

G. M. Kirkwood, "A Survey of Recent Publications Concerning Classical Greek Lyric Poetry," CW 47 (1953-54) 33-42, 49-54.

W. Allen, Jr., "A Survey of Selected Ciceronian Bibliography, 1939-1953," CW 47 (1953-54) 129-139.

P. MacKendrick, "Herodotus: The Making of a World Historian," CW 47 (1953-54) 145-152.

E. L. Minar, Jr., "A Survey of Recent Work in Pre-Socratic Philosophy," CW 47 (1953-54) 161-170, 177-182.

A. K. Michels, "Early Roman Religion, 1945-1952," CW 48 (1954-55) 25-35, 41-45.

G. F. Else, "A Survey of Work on Aristotle's Poetics, 1940-1954," CW 48 (1954-55) 73-82.

C. W. Mendell, "Tacitus: Literature 1948-1953," CW 48 (1954-55) 121-125.

A. G. McKay, "A Survey of Recent Work on Aeschylus," CW 48 (1954-55) 145-150, 153-159.

P. De Lacy, "Some Recent Publications on Epicurus and Epicureanism," CW 48 (1954-55) 169-177.

F. M. Combellack, "Contemporary Homeric Scholarship: Sound or Fury?", CW 49 (1955-56) 17-26, 29-44, 45-55.

H. W. Miller, "A Survey of Recent Euripidean Scholarship, 1940-1954," CW 49 (1955-56) 81-92.

6. An article which I have not seen sounds most interesting: *F. S. Drew and D. S. Crawford, "Greek Comedy's Ancestry," *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Cairo* 9 (1947) and 10 (1948). According to the very brief report in Marouzeau, the authors attempt, by an analysis of the form and internal nature of the extant comedies, to derive Comedy from entertainments offered at weddings.

ancient drama. Pickard-Cambridge's earlier work, *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* (Oxford 1946) is also very useful; the second chapter includes a summary of the scenic and stage-arrangements assumed or required for each of the extant comedies. A recent article by Margarete Bieber, "Entrances and Exits of Actors and Chorus in Greek Plays," *AJA* 58 (1954) 277-281, attempts to reconstruct the stage-action and setting in several plays, including *Frogs*, which Miss Bieber believes was produced not in the great Theater of Dionysus but in the smaller Lenaion.

T. B. L. Webster, "The Masks of Greek Comedy," *BJR* 32 (1949) 97-133, provides a convenient list of the masks used in Old Comedy; although he begins with Pollux's list of the masks of New Comedy, he attempts to project some of these types back into Middle and Old Comedy, citing relevant evidence found in vases and statues. He also examines the extant plays of Aristophanes for evidence about the stock characters of Old Comedy, and discusses the probable mask used by each. Webster also considers "The Costume of the Actors in Aristophanic Comedy," *CQ* n.s. 5 (1955) 94-95, upholding (against Beare) the traditional view of the padded, phallus-wearing actor of Old Comedy—a view which seems well-supported by the available evidence.⁸

One particular type-character, common to all Greek Comedy, is studied in a special monograph by Hans Oeri, *Der Typ der komischen Alten in der griechischen Komödie* (Basel 1948). The work collects and discusses all the evidence for the comic Old Woman in Old, Middle, and New Comedy, Epicharmus, Dorian Farce, Mime, Phlyaces, etc.

Here it may be in order to call attention to the series of articles on Greek dances by Lillian Lawler.⁹ Miss Lawler usually starts from, or includes in her discussions, various passages in the text of Aristophanes (some of these will be noted below under the individual plays). Taken together, the articles give a detailed and well-documented picture of the kinds of dance movements and forms likely to have accompanied the ancient productions. Irvin Roos, *Die tragische Orchestik im Zerrbild der altattischen Komödie* (Lund 1951), also discusses dancing in comedy, mainly in connection with the exodus

of the *Wasps* (see below, section 6, under *Wasps*).

A minor controversy about the part of the chorus and the use of the direction "*chorou*" in later Aristophanic and Middle Comedy has occupied Messrs. W. Beare and E. W. Handley: see Beare, "*Chorou* in the *Heautontimorumenos* and the *Plutus*," *Hermathena* 74 (1949) 26-38; E. W. Handley, "*Chorou* in the *Plutus*," *CQ* n.s. 3 (1953) 55-61, which examines carefully mss. R and V, the scholia, and the text itself for evidence on the significance of this lemma; and Beare, "*Chorou* in the *Plutus*: A Reply to Mr. Handley,"

4. Aristophanes: Editions and Text

A new edition of the complete works of Aristophanes by R. Cantarella is now appearing, under the auspices of the Istituto Editoriale Italiano, Milano; to date I have received the following: Vol. I, *Prolegomena* (1949); Vol. II, *Ach., Eq.* (1953); Vol. III, *Nub., Vesp., Pax* (1954). The first volume contains the ancient and Byzantine commentaries and treatises on Comedy; most of them are also to be found in Kaibel, Van Leeuwen (*Prolegomena*), and Dübner, but it is convenient to have them re-edited here. The second part of this volume contains the ancient testimonia on the history of Comedy, the poets of Old Comedy, the life and work of Aristophanes; this is an extremely useful collection, although I have found it somewhat hard to use because of excessive condensation and cross-referencing. The two volumes of the plays are equipped with a general introduction to Aristophanes, special introductions to the individual plays, translation, and notes; the notes are very sparse and brief. The text is quite close to that of Coulon's Budé edition, and besides a full critical apparatus contains a list of the testimonia, with significant variants cited. Although I have not yet had the occasion to make extensive and careful use of this text, it appears to be one of the best editions available.

The Budé series is being re-issued; to date I have seen only Vol. I: *Les Acharniens, Les Cavaliers, Les Nuées*, 5th ed., ed. par V. Coulon, trad. par H. Van Daele (Paris 1952).¹⁰

The manuscript tradition has been recently restudied by D. Mervyn Jones, "The Manuscripts of A.'s *Knights*," *CQ* n.s. 2 (1952) 168-185 and n.s. 5 (1955) 39-49. M. Pohlenz in his article on the *Knights* (see below, section 6, under *Knights*) also discusses the problem of the text-tradition

8. See W. Beare, "The Costume of the Actors in Aristophanic Comedy," *CS* n.s. 4 (1954) 64-75.

9. *TAPA* 79 (1948) 254-267; 80 (1949) 230-237; 81 (1950) 78-88; 82 (1951) 62-70; *AJP* 72 (1951) 300-307.

10. Vol. IV (*Thesm., Ran.*) appeared in 1954 according to *Gnomon* 27 (1955) *Bibl. Beilage* No. 3, p. 42.

of the plays; he adduces strong arguments against the older view that all our mss. and commentary derive from a single ninth-century archetype.

There are remarks on the date of some of the manuscripts in an article by *W. J. W. Koster in *REG* 66 (1953) 1-33. The same scholar announces a forthcoming critical edition of the scholia of Aristophanes, including the commentary of Johannes Tzetzes on *Plut.*, *Nub.*, and *Ran.*; see W. J. W. Koster, "De Jo. Tzetzta Aristophanis Censore," *Dioniso* 15 (1952) 143-152.¹¹

5. *Aristophanes: General Works (Criticism, Social Background, etc.)*

A concise but good general introduction to Aristophanes, including remarks on the form and nature of Old Comedy, the poet's life and works, his originality and poetry, *et al.*, may be found in the new edition by Cantarella (Vol. II, pp. 13-28) discussed in the previous section. On the subject of the poet's life, a Polish article by *S. Srebrny, "De Aristophanis origine peregrino", *Charisteria Sinko* (Warsaw 1951) revives the old view that Aristophanes' father came from Aegina and received Attic citizenship shortly before the poet's birth.

The major book in English within the period under review falls under the heading of the social background of Aristophanes and his comedies; this is the second edition of V. Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Comedy* (Oxford 1951). The work has been almost entirely rewritten, and many of the objections of critics to the first edition are discussed and answered; the notes have been placed at the foot of the page for easier reference. There is an excellent critical review of the work by Gomme in *CR* n.s. 4 (1954) 13-16, which expresses certain reservations about the validity of Ehrenberg's conclusions.

Here may be briefly mentioned a curious

11. There is a new edition of the **Frogs* by L. Radermacher and W. Kraus (Vienna 1954; = *Sitz. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien* 198, No. 4) and an edition of **Acharnians* by C. F. Russo (Bari 1953). Except for these, I know of no new editions of individual plays. As for translations of the separate plays, there are a few translations into German which I have not seen (see *supra* note 3). Gilbert Murray's translation of the *Birds* into English (Oxford 1950) will be discussed in section 6.

The latest edition of W. H. Stahl's annual listing of "Inexpensive Books for Teaching the Classics," *CW* 49 (1955-56) 135ff., contains a handy list of translations of Aristophanes in inexpensive editions. Unfortunately, almost all of them are old translations, e.g., Frere, the "Anonymous," *et al.*; the five B. B. Rogers' versions in the Anchor Books series may be welcome.

work by Albert Cook, *The Dark Voyage and the Golden Mean: A Philosophy of Comedy* (Cambridge, Mass. 1949). Cook discusses the extant plays of Aristophanes in his third chapter ("Aristophanes: Symbol in Tribe. Concept in Empire") without succeeding in illuminating the comedies themselves or in clarifying his own muddy and incoherent theory of tragedy and comedy, which he presents in a series of "antinomies", or oppositions between wonderful/probable, individual/social, imagination/reason, extreme/mean, and so on for page after page. My younger readers may be surprised, and possibly amused, to learn that while death is "wonderful," sex is merely "probable" (pp. 26, 28). The work bristles with such turgid generalizations as this: "Society always condemns, casts out, or castrates its artists and saints" (p. 11). "Comedy in the normal joy of its own golden mean expels the abnormality of the dark voyager" (p. 59). This latter sentence is a fair example of Cook's style, and if a reader can stomach pages of this, he may find the work useful, or at least readable. It is perhaps otiose to criticize details in the treatment of Aristophanes: but it is hardly true that Aristophanes was "obsessed with homosexuality" (p. 35), and I cannot agree with the statement at the end of chapter three that Aristophanes was "a comic dramatist of the social and probable." The book seems to me to be an example of what the "New Criticism" can do to the Classics when a sound philological training is lacking.

Another treatment of the nature of comedy, with several chapters on an ancient comedy and its writers, may be found in H. Kindermann, *Meister der Komödie von Aristophanes bis G. B. Shaw* (Vienna and Munich 1952). The first section discusses the form and concept of comedy from its origins through the development of character-comedy and the later comic forms; the second part takes up individual writers and periods, with a chapter on Aristophanes and Menander. The work is highly abstract and theoretical, bristling with teutonic profundities. It is, however, only fair to warn the reader that I found the language of this book almost unintelligible, and like many German works of this nature, it occasionally deviates into sense, or what looks to me like sense. I suspect that further study of this work might uncover some worthwhile thoughts on the general nature of comedy.

A. Feldman, "The Quintessence of Comedy," *CJ* 43 (1947-48) 389-393, is another example of a rather silly attempt to expound a philosophy

of comedy, with some very inaccurate and gushing remarks on the Dionysiac spirit and the origins of tragedy and comedy. I regret having to be so severe on all theorists of comedy, but what is a classicist to think when he finds such statements as "the faith that Dionysus had no known father" (according to Euripides, people who think this come to a frightful end); or the statement on p. 392 that the most popular comedies in all times have to do with the cuckolding of the dull husband by a poor but dishonest lover. As is well known, not a single example of such a plot survives from antiquity; yet Feldman implies that it was as common in Greek comedy as in the Renaissance.

G. Perotta, "Aristofane," *Maia* 5 (1952) 1-31, offers a general treatment of the thought and poetry of our poet. Perotta argues that Aristophanes was purely a "poet," not a satirist; he had no strong political convictions, the attack on Cleon in the *Knights* being purely personal. In general, the plays have no didactic aim; they are comic and "poetic" fantasies, and the "real" Aristophanes must be sought in his "poetic" flights. Apparently, to Perotta poetry means something unreal, fantastic, and lacking in social significance.

A more conventional view is expressed by Virginia Paronizi, "L'Ideale politica d'Aristofane," *Dioniso* 11 (1948) 26-42, who believes that Aristophanes was a political idealist who yearned for an ennobled, purified Athens; some of the details of this reformed and purified *polis* may be seen in the *Birds*. Political matters also engage the attention of M. Gigante, "Echi di vita politica nelle *Ecclesiazusae* di A.," *Dioniso* 11 (1948) 147-151 (see section 6, under *Ecc.*).¹²

A number of articles treat dramatic and comic technique; perhaps the most important of these is W. Süß, "Scheinbare und wirkliche Incongruenzen in den Dramen des A.," *Rh.M* 97 (1954) 115-159, 229-254, 289-316. This three-part, detailed, and somewhat wordy article starts out by rejecting the common nineteenth-century view that frequent and violent inconsistencies and illogicality in the structure and individual scenes of the plays must be attributed to later revisions or to contaminations of two versions of the same play. The most notorious case of this type

of argument concerns the *Clouds*, but the same reasoning has often been applied to our texts of *Plutus*, *Frogs*, *Acharnians*, *Thesmophoriazusae*, and *Peace*. Süß would accept such inconsistencies as part of the normal dramatic method of Aristophanes; as he points out, the carelessness in dramatic structure and the inconsistency in details do not decrease as the poet grew older and more experienced; nor does his handling of these matters lead toward the tighter dramatic structure of New Comedy. Most of the inconsistencies can be attributed to a desire for strong comic effects: e.g., violent threats, which are unfulfilled; breaking of the dramatic illusion; breaking through the allegorical disguise; jests and statements *para prosdokian*; inconsistencies in the portrayal of women. As a general rule of thumb it may be stated that once a motif or theme has done its work as a comic piece of business, it is allowed to drop without any concern for what should logically follow. The articles are filled with detailed discussions of specific passages in the comedies, with many fine insights; luckily for future users, Süß provides an index of the main passages discussed.

Katherine Lever, "Poetic Metaphor and Allegory in A.," *CW* 46 (1952-53) 220-223, discusses some of the allegorical characters (e.g., Diallagê in *Lys.*) and points out precedents for such characters in Aeschylus, Epicharmus, and lyric poetry. George F. Osmun, "Building up Comic Steam," *CJ* 49 (1953-54) 85-89, calls attention to Aristophanes' "build-up", or accumulating technique; not all his examples seem to fit the category which he discusses. F. J. Leclercq, "The Basis of Ancient Parody," *G & R* 23 (1954) 66-81, includes discussions of several passages in Aristophanes; he argues that our poet's technique represents the most advanced development of parody, a type which selects and illuminates specific traits of the author or material treated.

The attitude and relationship of Aristophanes to Euripides seems to have had more than its usual share of attention. R. E. Wycherley, "Aristophanes and Euripides," *G & R* 15 (1946) 98-107, supports Gilbert Murray's thesis that Aristophanes loved Euripides, despite his faults, and was greatly drawn toward him. This point of view is based on the questionable assumption that "parody, even merciless parody does not necessarily mean complete condemnation." Wycherley is on sounder ground, I think, when he points out the area of agreement in both poets on the subject of basic and political ideas.¹³

12. A. Louvain dissertation, *G. Demerbe, *Aristophane et Cleon* (Louvain 1946) must also be concerned with political matters. *F. Frey, "Zur Komödie des A.," *MH* 5 (1948) 168-177, discusses the concept of *sôtêria* in the comedies. H. R. Butts, *The Glorification of Athens in Greek Drama* (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology XI [1947]) has a section on Aristophanes (pp. 176-214).

13. The other treatments of this topic I have not been

6. Aristophanes: Individual Plays *Acharnians*

Lillian Lawler, "Orchêsis Kallinikos," *TAPA* 79 (1948) 254-267, considers the victory-dance at the end of this play, together with other appearances of the phrase 'Tenella kallinikos' in Aristophanes, and uses these passages as part of the evidence for the dance-form investigated. *Knights*

Max Pohlenz, "Aristophanes' Ritter," *Nach. der Akad. der Wiss. in Göttingen* (1952) 95-128, submits the whole of this play to a detailed, acute analysis. He stresses as his major point the fairly obvious fact that the fundamental idea of the whole play is simply that Cleon can only be overthrown by a politician still more vulgar and impudent than Cleon himself. From this point of view he defends the illogical conclusion in the exodos as necessary for a satisfying ending: Aristophanes cannot represent the overthrow of the hated demagogue Cleon as leading to a political situation which is worse; such an admission would be to defeat the whole purpose of the play. We therefore get the famous rejuvenation and "conversion" of Demos. Pohlenz also discusses the problem of the Second Parabasis; he interprets the scholium on line 1288 to mean that certain Alexandrian philologues inferred that the whole Parabasis was written by Eupolis; but unlike A. Colonna (*infra*), Pohlenz believes that this was an unwarranted and incorrect ancient conjecture.

A. Colonna, "Aristofane ed Eupoli nella seconda parabasi dei Cavalieri," *Dioniso* 15 (1952) 32-38, argues that Eupolis did in fact write the entire second parabasis.

Lillian Lawler discusses, in *AJP* 72 (1951) 300-307, the evidence for the Greek cuckoo dance-figure, starting with the expression 'periekokkasa' in *Knights* 697.

Clouds

W. Schmid, "Das Sokratesbild der Wolken," *Philologus* 97 (1948) 209-228, argues that the picture of Socrates in this play is much closer to the historical figure than is usually believed. Also on the "Socrates-problem," E. A. Havelock, "Why was Socrates Tried?," *Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood* (Toronto 1952) 95-109, uses

the *Clouds* as evidence for his view that Socrates aroused deep hostility and resentment because of his threatened revolution in attempting to remove the task of cultural, or "general education" from the control of the family-group. This excellent and provocative article is too important to be adequately summarized in a brief statement here; it is, however, only slightly concerned with Aristophanes.

For further remarks on Socrates in Aristophanes, see the article by R. Stark discussed below (under *Birds*). Another long and exhaustive treatment of the "Socrates-problem" of the *Clouds* by H. Erbse, "Socrates im Schatten der Aristophanischen Wolken," *Hermes* 82 (1954) 385-420, reached me too late to be discussed in this survey. To judge, however, by the concluding paragraphs, Erbse believes that we cannot use the *Clouds* as evidence either for the thought of the Presocratics, or for a picture of the historical Socrates.

B. Marzullo, "Strepsiade," *Maia* 6 (1953) 99-124, starting from the ancient belief in the real significance of proper names, goes on to discuss the connotations of the name of the protagonist of the *Clouds*, and collects a series of word-plays on 'strephein' and related words in this drama.

R. Goosens, "Le vrai sens d'un vers des Nuées (414)," *LEC* (1949) 22-28, examines the three qualities which are listed in this verse as the indispensable qualities of a student.

*A. Laumonier, "Yoga Hellénique," *Annales Fac. Lettres Toulouse* 2 (1952) 17-37, apparently finds evidence in Aristophanes for a sort of "Socratic Yoga."

Wasps

Lillian Lawler, "Airein Maschalên and Associated Orchestic Schêmata," *TAPA* 80 (1949) 230-237, suggests that the correct interpretation of line 1529 is "Slap yourself in the stomach" (while leaping in a violent dance-movement).

E. Roos, *Die tragische Orchestik* etc. (see above, section 3), gives a full and detailed study of the whole closing scene of the *Wasps*, in an attempt to determine more precisely the exact nature of the various schêmata alluded to in the text (e.g., *lugismata*, or *igidisma*, *eklaktisma*, *strobilos*, etc.). Roos examines and rejects former interpretations of this scene, all of which assume that some theatrical dance, whether comic, tragic, or satyric, is here presented or parodied. His own conclusion is that the scene parodies the voluptuous dances of the *hetairai*, which were often presented at symposia and sometimes were taken up and imitated by the drunken *kômastai* in their later revels. In this way, Roos

able to see; they are: *C. Prato, *Euripide nella critica di Aristophane* (Galatina [Lecce]: Mariano 1946 [rpt. 1955]); *O. J. Todd, "Euripides and A.," *Trans. Royal Soc. of Canada*, ser. III (1948) 115-135; *F. Starck, *Die Charakteristik des Euripides in den Stücken des A.* (Diss. Vienna 1952); *J. Czerniatowicz, "Euripides in Attic Comedy," *Eos* 45 (1951). A summary of the last article may be found in *CR* n.s. 4 (1954) 68.

argues, Aristophanes shows his disapproval of the direction which contemporary tragic dances were taking—a development which led in time to a pantomime, where elaborate ballet-type dancing replaced tragedy altogether. This explanation fits, Roos thinks, the general “tendency” of the *Wasps*, which satirizes in the character of Philocleon contemporary Athenian life.

Peace

The place of this play among the other “pacifist” comedies is discussed by *B. de Aras, “La Paz de A.,” *Helmantica* 3 (1952) 33-52.

Birds

H. L. Crosby, “The Bird-Riddle Re-examined,” *Hesperia*, Suppl. 8 (= *Comm. Studies in Honor of T. L. Shear*; Princeton 1949) 74-81, rejects Blake’s theory of a 28-member chorus in this play, as well as several other explanations for the presence of the four extra birds at the opening of the parodos; Crosby himself argues that the four extras were the musicians for this comedy.

E. M. Blaiklock, “Walking away from the News: An Autobiographical Interpretation of A.’s *Birds*,” *G & R* 2d s. 1 (1954) 98-111, presents his own personal interpretation of the play as an “escape-piece,” drawing parallels between the mood of Athens in 414 B.C. and the anxiety felt by all members of the British Commonwealth of Nations during the critical days of September 1940.

M. Gigante, “La città dei giusti in Esiodo e gli *Uccelli* di A.,” *Dioniso* 11 (1948) 17-25, compares Hesiod’s vision of the ideal *polis* (*W & D*. 225-269) with the description of Nephelokokygia: he believes he can detect direct influence of Hesiod on certain passages of the play.

R. Stark, “Socratisches in den ‘Vogeln’ des A.,” *RhM* 96 (1953) 77-89, discusses several passages in this play (lines 1210f., 1282, 1553ff., and 604f.), with particular attention to the meaning of *eirôn* and related words in Aristophanes’ criticisms of Socrates. Although Socrates is mentioned by name in only one of these four passages, Stark believes that the audience would catch the allusions to genuine Socratic doctrines and methods. The tone of the satire in this play, and in the still later *Frogs*, suggests a change in Socrates’ interests and investigations between 418 (the date of the revised *Clouds*) and 414 B.C. Stark assumes that the picture of Socrates in the *Clouds* is reasonably accurate.

Lillian Lawler, “‘Limewood’ Cinesias and the Dithyrambic Dance,” *TAPA* 81 (1950) 78-88, collects and discusses the comic satire against

this poet, who is lampooned in *Birds* 1373-1409. J. R. T. Pollard, “The *Birds* of A.: A Sourcebook for Old Beliefs,” *AJP* 69 (1948) 353-376, discusses such matters as Zeus and the woodpecker, Zeus and the cuckoo, etc., starting from various passages of the play. J. Whatmough, “On ‘Triballic’ in A. (*Birds* 1615),” *CPh* 47 (1952) 26, proposes a Thracian oath, ‘na Belsourdon’ for the apparently unintelligible gibberish of the Triballian at this point.

It may be pertinent to add a few remarks on Gilbert Murray’s translation of the *Birds* (Oxford 1950), since the brief introduction offers some interpretations of the play. Murray seems to me to overstate the case for taking the play as a pure “escape-comedy”: he does not mention the fact that in the second part of the play Aristophanes does not allow us or himself to escape so very far from the city of Athens, “with its taxes and its regulations and fines and prohibitions and the follies of its exasperated demos.” In fact, a great deal of the fun in this comedy is found in the unseasonable appearance in the sky of so many objectionable types from Athens. Nor is it fair to say (as Murray does on page 8) that nearly all the individuals whom Aristophanes pillories in the *Birds* are condemned by subsequent history: the list includes Socrates, Prodicus, Gorgias, Meton and Diagoras, most of whom get a very good press, at least in the history of science and philosophy. It is worth noting, too, that the unfavorable historical judgment on others rests, in many cases, entirely on the statements of Aristophanes himself. Murray seems to have an odd opinion of the tolerant sense of fun of fifth-century Athenians when he writes: “The last few scenes of the play are exceedingly funny, but it seems odd that, at a time of so much religious excitement in Athens, they did not lead to a prosecution for impiety.” To solve this problem (which I believe to be almost entirely invented by Murray himself), he has recourse, in the best anthropological fashion, to the New Year King and his annual festival. The translation itself is one of Murray’s usual skillful and musical performances, although (if I may momentarily assume the mantle of Bentley) “you cannot call it Aristophanes.”

Thesmophoriazusae

Tragic influences and parody in this play have been the subject of three articles by H. W. Miller: (1) “Some Tragic Influences in the *Thesm. of A.*,” *TAPA* 77 (1946) 171-182; (2) “On the Parabasis of the *Thesm. of A.*,” *CPh* 42 (1947) 180-181 (verbal echoes of Euripides’

Melanippé Desmôtis); and (3) "Euripides' *Telephus* and the *Thesm.* of A.," *CPh* 43 (1948) 174-183, which discusses the wellknown parallels between the lost tragedy and the first part of this comedy. W. Mitsdorfer, "Das Mnesilochuslied in A.'s *Thesm.* (Die Parodie einer tragischen Monodie)," *Philologus* 98 (1954) 59-93, also studies parody, in this case of Euripides' *Andromeda*. The article is part of a dissertation on parody of Euripides by Aristophanes.

A. Baffoni, "Ippocrate in A.," *Maia* 1 (1948) 194-197, argues unconvincingly that the "household of Hippocrates" in *Thesm.* 273 refers to the gods listed in the opening of the Hippocratic Oath.

Frogs

H. B. Sedgwick, "The *Frogs* and the Audience," *C & M* 9 (1947) 1-9, treats the problem of the extent of the audience's knowledge of tragedy and its ability to recognize the many tragic echoes found in this play. Sedgwick, noting that papyrus would be scarce and expensive toward the end of the Peloponnesian War, argues that we cannot assume the existence of a large "reading" public; he suggests that the audience was familiar with the plays because so many of them had at one time or another performed as choristers in tragedy (a view which I have long supported) and because of frequent repetitions of the more popular plays in the country demes at the rural Dionysia.

Ecclesiazusae and *Plutus*

Both fourth-century plays are discussed by T. B. L. Webster in his *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester 1953); he argues that these last two plays show no lessening of genius or vitality; nor is there a complete loss of political interest, as is commonly supposed; the political references in the two comedies are explained in his second chapter. Despite the great authority of Webster in these matters, I suspect that most readers will continue to feel a lessening of vitality in these later plays and will find the political tone of the plays far less intense and interesting than in the great plays of the 420's.

Karl K. Hulley, "The Prologue of the *Ecc.*," *CW* 46 (1952-53) 129-131, suggests that the chorus enters singly during the prologue, to rehearse their roles at the coming meeting of the ecclesia; all the speakers in this scene, except Praxagora, are probably members of the chorus, not actors. The play therefore has no proper parodos, as the chorus is entirely present before its first collective song at 285-310. This crisp, valuable article indicates Aristophanes' many

interesting departures from the normal, traditional structure of Old Comedy.

M. Gigante, "Echi di vita politica nelle *Ecc. di A.*," *Dioniso* 11 (1948) 147-151, discusses the references to Epicrates and Cephalos in lines 71 and 248ff., and the debate over the Corinthian alliance in 193-208.

The controversy over the ancient stage-direction 'chorou' in the *Plutus* has already been mentioned (section 3).

7. Language and Meter

E. W. Handley, "-sis Nouns in A.," *Eranos* 51 (1953) 129-142, notes that such words are more frequent in *Clouds*, *Thesm.*, and *Frogs*, and may have had a sophistic, intellectual, or poetic flavor. They become common in the more abstract prose writings of the fourth century. I have not seen *F. Schmid, *Die Deminutiva auf -ion im Vokativ bei Aristophanes* (Winterthur 1954).

A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* (Cambridge 1948) analyzes many of the lyric passages in Aristophanes, and is extremely useful for its clear and concise discussion of many metrical problems. See especially the Index Locorum, s.v. Aristophanes. M. Platnauer, "Dactyls in Comic Trochaics," *CR* n.s. 1 (1951) 132-133, suggests several easy emendations to remove these offending feet from Aristophanes' trochaic tetrameters. A work which I have not seen is *A. da Costa Ramalho, "Notas Metricas a A.," *Humanitas* 4 (1952) 19-31.

8. Influence and 'Nachleben'

J. M. Raines, "Comedy and the Comic Poets in the Greek Epigram," *TAPA* 77 (1946) 83-102, lists and discusses epigrams which express some sort of literary judgment on comedy; these passages are then treated as evidence for the history of ancient interest in comedy and for the taste of various periods.

Armando Plebe, *La Teoria del Comico da Aristotele a Plutarco* (Torino 1952), also treats this latter point in his reconstruction of Aristotle's theory of comedy and its successors in antiquity. He notes the brief revival of interest in Old Comedy in the time of Ptolemy II, and the appreciation of Aristophanes by the Atticists of the Second Sophistic. There is a very interesting discussion of Plutarch's judgment in his *Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander*; Plutarch's low valuation of the older type of comedy was the logical consequence of his aesthetic theories, which derive largely from Aristotle and peripatetic sources. The work concludes with a critical appendix on the chrono-

logical order of some of the Prolegomena and on the sources of various Byzantine tractates on Comedy.

R. Avallone, "Catullo e A.," *Antiquitas* 2 (1947) 11-49, attempts at great length, but without much success, to show direct imitation of Aristophanes by the Latin poet. W. J. W. Koster, "De Jo. Tzetza Aristophanis Censore," *Dioniso* 15 (1952) 143-152, gives a few samples of Tzetzes' comments on Aristophanes. Katherine Lever, "Greek Comedy on the Sixteenth Century English Stage," *CJ* 42 (1946-47) 169-174, cites two performances of Aristophanes (*Plutus* in 1536 and *Peace* in 1546, both at Cambridge) as the only known performances in England during this century. She believes that both plays had a message appropriate to the political situation of the times.

G. Highet's useful *Classical Tradition* (Oxford 1949) has, alas! all too little on Aristophanes. A glance at his Index, under Aristophanes, reveals how small a part has been played by these comedies in the history of European comedy and humor. It also suggests a dearth of investigations into the subject; is this entirely because there is so little to investigate? Some useful material for further investigation may be gathered from R. R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage* (Cambridge 1954); see especially Appendix I, pp. 495-496, for a convenient list of manuscripts of Aristophanes known to have been in Italy prior to 1500. The work also contains a few references to the educational role assigned to the reading of Aristophanes by the Humanists; it is of special interest to note that a programme for Jesuit Colleges, drawn up in 1551, recommends readings from the *Plutus* in the beginning Greek class.

9. Other poets of Old Comedy

No very significant new work in this field is known to me. The new fragments are discussed in a dissertation which I have not seen: *S. Kurz, *Die neuen Fragmenten der attischen Alten Komödie* (Diss. Tübingen 1948). A thorough study of Cratinus has been made in a Dutch dissertation, with a good and full French summary: J. Th. M. F. Pieters, *Cratinus, Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis der Vroegattische Comedie* (Leiden 1946). For Plato Comicus we now have the article by A. Körte, "Plato (Komiker)," *RE* XX. 2 (1950) 2537-2541. K. J. Dover in the chapter in Platnauer (cited above at the beginning of this article) calls for the utmost skepticism and caution in reconstructing lost comic plots from the fragments; he gives an

example of his own careful method of critical reconstruction in "Plato Comicus: *Presbeis* and *Hellas*," *CR* 64 (1950) 5-7. Eupolis is treated in the article by Colonna cited above (section 6, under *Knights*), in connection with his relations with Aristophanes and the famous quarrel over his contributions to the *Knights*. Fragments of various poets of Old Comedy are frequently cited in Ehrenberg's book and in Oeri's monograph on the comic Old Woman (see section 5).

10. Sicilian and Italiote Comedy: *Phlyaces* and *Mimes*

This topic has received a good deal of attention lately. The fragments of Rhinthon and and Sophron have been re-edited with a commentary by Olivieri (cited above, section 2, under Epicharmus), Parts II and III; to the literary fragments of Rhinthon has been added a catalogue of the most important plastic representations of phlyaces. This same evidence is more fully and conveniently handled in a little volume by L. M. Catteruccia, *Pitture vascolari italiote di soggetto teatrale comico* (Rome 1951), which lists and describes about 90 vases which represent phlyaces and other popular farces. It is most unfortunate that the illustrations in this work are so poorly reproduced.

The relationship of the South Italian farces to Attic Comedy is still disputed. T. B. L. Webster, "South Italian Vases and Attic Drama," *CQ* 42 (1948) 15-27, suggests that the phlyaces represent scenes borrowed from the roughly contemporaneous Middle Comedy, which preserved to a great extent the traditional costume of Old Comedy; hence the appearance of the costume of the actors of Old Comedy on the later vases. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, "South Italian Vases and Attic Drama," *CQ* 43 (1949) 57, answers Webster with the sound observation that the plays (or the myths on which the plays were based) had been the common possession of the Greek world for many years; there is no reason why South Italian playwrights or vasepainters had to go to Attic productions to get these scenes. Pickard-Cambridge also treats this problem in his *Dramatic Festivals* (cited in section 3), where he discusses the costumes and masks of the phlyaces; he believes that these Italiote farces were connected with the older mime on the mainland, a form which still survived in Greece in the fourth century (evidence cited on pp. 237f. of *Dramatic Festivals*).

For a recent interpretation of a single vase see J. D. Beazley, "The New York Phlyax Vase," *AJA* 56 (1952) 193-195, where it is suggested

that the old man bound with his hands over his head is the victim of a magic, binding spell. J. Whatmough, "On 'Triballic' in Aristophanes (*Birds* 1615)," *CPh* 47 (1952) 26, reaffirms a suggestion he made many years ago that the apparently unintelligible gibberish of one of the characters on this same vase, is perfectly good Greek, if read retrograde, and means "Pick up the basket."

Although Middle Comedy falls outside the scope of this summary, one should mention in passing the important work being done in this field by T. B. L. Webster, since it throws much light on the later plays of Aristophanes and on the later development of Old Comedy in general. See especially Webster's two articles: "The Masks of Greek Comedy" (cited above, section 5), and "Chronological Notes on Middle Comedy," *CQ* n.s. 2 (1952) 13-26, which attempts to date over 100 lost plays, and thus to provide some data for a picture of the development of comedy between 400 and 320 B.C. Finally, there is his excellent, informative book, *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester 1953), which gathers together in one volume much of his previous work.

* * * *

I may conclude this serious survey on a lighter note: Aristophanes still exerts some influence in theatrical circles, and a group in New York tried a modern revival of the *Thesmophoriazusa* last December. The play was apparently a flop, partly because of a very inadequate translation, but also for other reasons which any college professor of classics could have predicted. Still, there is hope that we may see another successful production of one of the comedies, to rival the *Lysistrata* of 1930. The great Athenian comic poet is not forgotten, though he may not always be appreciated.

CHARLES T. MURPHY

OBERLIN COLLEGE

NOTES AND NEWS

The American Academy in Rome has been informed that Fulbright grants will be offered for the 1957 Summer Session of the School of Classical Studies. Latin teachers who are interested in obtaining such a grant should apply before October 1, 1956, to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington 25, D. C.

The John Hay Whitney Foundation has announced that it is accepting applications for the John Hay Fellowship program for 1957-58. Nominations will be welcomed on behalf of qualified public high school teachers in the states of Georgia, Kentucky, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Washington, and West Virginia.

Fellowships for a period of one academic year will be awarded to a limited number of outstanding senior high school teachers from these eight states for study in the broad area of the humanities at either Yale University or Columbia University. Fellowship awards will include stipends equal to the salaries received from the employing school during the fellowship year. In no case will the award be less than \$3,000 and grants for tuition and transportation are also given.

Applicants are nominated by the local superintendent of schools or other school official who is in a position to help plan a proposed program of graduate studies and to utilize the Fellows' new experience upon their return to high school teaching. Each teacher accepted for study as a John Hay Fellow must be granted a year's leave by his employing school system and must agree to return to it following his university work for at least one year. Teachers must be no more than 45 years of age and have at least five years of high school teaching experience, the most recent two of which shall have been in the present employing school system.

Inquiries from teachers and administrators should be directed to the Division of the Humanities, John Hay Whitney Foundation, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York 20, New York. The deadline for receipt of completed nominations is May 31, 1956.

PERSONALIA

Dr. Christine Mohrmann, Professor of Early Christian Latin at the Universities of Nijmegen

Copies of the *Classical Weekly* "List of Classical Societies in the United States and Canada," published in Volume 48, No. 16, the first comprehensive listing of its kind, may be obtained by writing the *CW* editorial office, Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y. The price is twenty cents to subscribers to *CW*, thirty cents to non-subscribers.

The list enumerates 104 national, regional, state, and local groups, with available information concerning officers, membership, dues, activities, and publications.

and Amsterdam, is a visiting lecturer in the Liturgy Program of the 1956 University of Notre Dame summer school.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- ANDREWES, A. *The Greek Tyrants*. ("Hutchinson's University Library: Classical History and Literature," ed. H. T. Wade-Gery.) London: Hutchinson's University Library; New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc., 1936. Pp. 164. \$1.80* (text), \$2.40 net (trade) (8s 6d).
- ARROWSMITH, WILLIAM, WITTER BYNNER, and RICHMOND LATTIMORE (trans.). *Euripides, II: Cyclops, Heracles* (Arrowsmith), *Iphigenia in Tauris* (Bynner), *Helen* (Lattimore). ("The Complete Greek Tragedies," ed. D. Grene and R. Lattimore.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936. Pp. v, 264. \$1.25 (paper), \$3.75 (cloth).
- EARLE, GARDNER WADE (trans.). *Moments with (and without) Horace*. 2d ed. Cleveland: American Weave Press, 1950. Pp. iv, 45. \$1.00. (To be ordered from the author, 6229 Crestwood, Sarasota, Fla.)
- FRANZRO, CARLO MARIA. *The Life and Times of Nero*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. 334; 12 pl. \$4.75.
- MERLAN, PHILIP. *From Platonism to Neoplatonism*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1953. Pp. xvi, 210. 12 Fl.
- MODRZEJEWSKI, J. *Polish Papyrology in the Years 1945-1955*. Warsaw: Polish Academy of Sciences, 1955. Pp. 53. No price stated.
- PARROT, ANDRÉ. *Discovering Buried Worlds*. 2d ed. Translated by EDWIN HUDSON. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. Pp. 128; 30 ill.; 5 maps. \$3.75.
- PICHLER, THEODORICH, O.S.B. *Das Fasten bei Basileios dem Grossen und im antiken Heidentum*. ("Commentationes Aenipontanae," XI.) Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner, 1955. Pp. 135. No price stated.
- [This series appears to have been revived after a lapse since 1924. Nos. I-X (1906-24), containing certain titles often difficult to obtain in this country, are apparently in print with the exception of No. IX (J. Huber, *De Lingua Antiquissimorum Graeciae Incolarum*, 1921).]
- SIDGWICK, ARTHUR, and F. D. MORICE. *An Introduction to Greek Verse Composition*. With exercises. 19th (rev.) impr. London-New York-Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955. Pp. ix, 225. \$3.75 (18s). Key, 15s.
- "This new impression . . . has been seen through the press by Sir James Mountford . . . No important changes of substance have been made, but the illustrative passages from Greek authors have been verified in modern texts, slips in accentuation have been corrected, and in the Vocabulary fuller information about quantities has been given."
- STÉGEN, GUILLAUME. *Etude sur cinq Bucoliques de Virgile* (1, 2, 4, 5, 7). Namur: Wesmael-Charlier, 1955. Pp. 111. No price stated.

THE ROMAN MIND

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THOUGHT FROM CICERO TO MARCUS AURELIUS

By M. L. CLARKE. The adaptation of Greek ideas by Rome, the relation of these ideas to inherited tradition and the outlook of Rome's intellectual leaders form the subject of Professor Clarke's new book, which is admirably documented and distinguished by great clarity and ease of exposition. He shows us how Greek philosophy modified the old Roman outlook on life and how it helped to form the culture of the Ciceronian age; discusses the ideas of the Augustan period and those of the early Empire; and finally writes of that distinctive Roman contribution to the art of living expressed in the word "humanitas." His book will introduce students of the Classics to an aspect of ancient Rome which tends to be ignored in the standard histories of Rome and of Latin literature.

\$3.75



Through your bookseller, or from

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS